

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

**1:30 p.m., Thursday, December 15, 2005**  
**San Mateo County Transit District Office<sup>1</sup>**  
**1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium**  
**San Carlos, California**

### TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- |  |        |               |
|--|--------|---------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes).   | Kline  | No materials. |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approved – Agreement with the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance for the support of an employer-based shuttle program in SSF.</li><li>• Approved – Process and criteria for the allocation of Federal Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (RBPP) funding.</li><li>• Approved – Reappointment of BPAC public members.</li><li>• Approved – Amendment to the agreement with Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance for regional rideshare (MTC) funding.</li><li>• Approved – Appointment of two new TAC members: Cullinan (San Carlos) and Mothershead (Daly City).</li><li>• Adoption of the 2005 Congestion Management Program (CMP) for San Mateo County.</li><li>• Approved – 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County.</li><li>• Approved – Authorized the C/CAG Executive Director to negotiate MOU with Caltrans for ramp metering, and authorized C/CAG Chair to execute said MOU.</li><li>• Approved – Incentive program for local jurisdictions to participate in the development and implementation of the transportation and land use plan for the El Camino Real Corridor.</li></ul> | Wong   | No materials. |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from October 20, 2005.  | Wong   | Pages 1-4     |
| 4. Recommendation of 2006/07 TFCA Expenditure Program.   | Wong   | Pages 5-7     |
| 5. Measure A Strategic Plan (status update).   | Hurley | Oral Report   |
| 6. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Cycle Local Streets and Roads Program.  | Kline  | Pages 8-28    |
| 7. ABAG/MTC projections for population growth for the years 2025, 2015, and 2005.  | Duino  | Oral Report   |
| 8. Member Reports.   | Kline  |               |

---

<sup>1</sup> For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

## 2005 ROSTER OF TAC MEMBERS

Marc Roddin/		
Kenneth Folan	-	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Ian McAvoy	-	San Mateo County Transit District
Joseph Hurley	-	San Mateo County Transportation Authority
April Chan	-	Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
Mark Duino	-	San Mateo County Planning
Meg Monroe	-	Burlingame Planning
Neil Cullen	-	San Mateo County Engineering
Larry Patterson	-	San Mateo City Engineering
Mo Sharma	-	Daly City Engineering
Fernando Bravo	-	East Palo Alto Engineering
Parviz Mokhtari	-	San Carlos Engineering
Jon Lynch	-	Redwood City Engineering
Ruben Nino	-	Menlo Park Engineering
George Bagdon	-	Burlingame Engineering
Merrill Buck	-	San Bruno Engineering
Geoff Kline	-	C/CAG Congestion Management Program
Ray Davis	-	Belmont Engineering
Van Ocampo	-	Pacifica Engineering
Gene Gonzalo	-	CalTrans
Reza (Ray) M. Razavi-	-	South San Francisco Engineering
Rick Mao	-	Colma Engineering
Duncan Jones	-	Atherton Engineering
Ray Towne	-	Foster City Engineering
Liz Cullinan	-	San Carlos Planning
Tatum Mothershead	-	Daly City Planning

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)  
FOR THE  
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**October 20, 2005**

**MINUTES**

The one hundred fifty-sixth (156<sup>th</sup>) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Geoffrey Kline called the meeting to order at 1:18 p.m. on Thursday, October 20, 2005.

TAC members attending the meeting were:

Neil Cullen - San Mateo County Engineer (Co-Chair)  
Ray Davis - Belmont  
Gene Gonzalo - Caltrans  
Rick Mao - Colma  
Meg Monroe - Burlingame  
Parviz Mokhtari - San Carlos  
Rubin Niño - Menlo Park  
Van Ocampo - Pacifica  
Ray Razavi - South San Francisco  
Mo Sharma - Daly City  
Mark Duino - San Mateo County  
Jon Lynch - Redwood City  
Fernando Bravo - East Palo Alto  
Ray Towne - Foster City  
George Bagdon - Burlingame  
Duncan Jones - Atherton  
Kenneth Folan - MTC

Others attending the meeting were:

Richard Napier, Walter Martone and Sandy Wong, C/CAG  
Pat Dixon - San Mateo County Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee  
Brian Lee - San Mateo County Public Works  
Christine Maley-Grubl - Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance  
Ron Popp - City of Millbrae  
Erik Alm - Caltrans  
Richard Cook - SamTRANS  
Kent Dewell - Town of Woodside  
Mike Garvey

**1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.**

Geoff Kline welcomed the two new TAC members appointed by C/CAG in September 2005. They are Duncan Jones of Atherton and Ray Towne of Foster City.

**2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings.**

As shown on Agenda.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from July 21, 2005.**

Approved.

**4. Response to comments from MTC on the Draft 2005 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and recommendation to adopt the Final 2005 CMP for San Mateo County.**

Sandy Wong stated that the Draft 2005 CMP has been out for public review and comment with the closing date of September 15, 2005. Comments were received from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Revisions based on comments received have been incorporated into the Final 2005 CMP.

The Final 2005 CMP was accepted by the TAC and recommended for adoption. Members also suggested the possibility of making CD copies instead of paper copy to save printing cost. Also, when electronic copies are published, sequential page numbering should be added.

**5. Review and approve criteria for implementation of the ramp metering program in San Mateo County and authorization for the C/CAG Executive Director to negotiate a MOU with Caltrans for the implementation of a ramp metering program, and authorization for the C/CAG Chairman to execute said MOU.**

Sandy Wong presented the ramp metering program in terms of implementation phasing, schedule, and process. Phase 1 will be on US 101 from Santa Clara County Line to south of Route 92. Phase 2 will be on US 101 from north of Route 92 to San Francisco County Line. Phase 3 will be on I-280 from I-380 to San Francisco County Line. There will be a meter at every on-ramp. However, the metering rate will vary at each ramp. That is, the green versus red time will be tailored to the demand of each on-ramp. A Ramp Metering Technical Committee (RMTC) has been established with one staff representative from each jurisdiction as appointed by the jurisdiction, as well as staff from C/CAG, SMCTA, Caltrans, and MTC. The RMTC will be the technical decision making group regarding all implementation details such as metering rate, the MOU, "before" and "after" monitoring locations, etc. There will be spillback detectors installed at the beginning of each on-ramp to monitor queuing.

Member Davis moved and Co-Chair Cullen seconded the motion to approve the ramp metering program as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

**6. Recommendation on funding support for a project to interconnect and modify signals, upgrade controllers and other improvements on El Camino Real between Menlo Park and Millbrae.**

Sandy Wong presented the recommendation on interconnect and modify signals, upgrade controllers on El Camino Real from Menlo Park to Millbrae. This project is initiated by Caltrans in the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP). However, it's State policy that this type of project must be half (50%) funded by local jurisdictions. Caltrans contacted the local cities along the El Camino Real and was informed by the cities that they are supportive of the project but will not have the funding available in the time frame of the project. As a result, Caltrans contacted C/CAG for financial support. Since this project is consistent with C/CAG's vision on intelligent transportation system (ITS), and it will install some of the needed infrastructure for ITS implementation, it is recommended that C/CAG will provide financial support to fund the local share. Walter Martone noted that the reason for the project ending at Millbrae is because signals are already interconnected north of Millbrae.

Member Bagdon stated that the recommendation should be modified to "C/CAG will fund the entire local share". Member Bagdon moved/Member Davis second the motion to approve this item with the above modification. Motion was passed unanimously.

**7. Recommendations on the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County.**

C/CAG Executive Director Richard Napier presented the San Mateo County share of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave to Millbrae Auxiliary Lane Project remains the number one priority in San Mateo County. Most of the projects are being carried over from the 2004 STIP to the 2006 STIP. The 2006 also has some capacity to add new projects in the most outer year which is fiscal year 2010/11. The TAC accepted the recommendation as presented.

**8. Review and approval of an incentive program for local jurisdictions to participate in the development and implementation of a transportation and land use plan for the El Camino Real.**

Richard Napier presented the incentive program for transportation and land use planning for El Camino Real. C/CAG will provide up to \$50,000 matching grant to a jurisdiction that will conduct a planning study for El Camino Real as well as participating in a workshop to be facilitated by C/CAG's consultant. As to what planning study will qualify for the grant and whether or not previously conducted studies would meet the qualification, the answer was C/CAG will make the determination.

There was some confusion regarding this program and the Grand Boulevard. Richard Napier reassured the TAC that the two programs will be coordinated to ensure consistency.

Member Gonzalo pointed out that Caltrans should be listed as one of the agencies that will define the transportation aspect. Richard Napier noted the comment and stated that Caltrans is a key part of this program.

**9. Recommendation to adopt Policy on Traffic Impact Analysis to determine impacts on the Congestion Management Program (CMP) Roadway Network resulting from roadway modifications, General Plan Updates, and land use development projects.**

Sandy Wong presented the revised draft policy on Traffic Impact Analysis to determine impacts on the CMP roadway network resulting from roadway modifications, General Plan updates, and land use development projects. This item was presented at the August 2004 and April 2005 TAC meetings. Since the April 2005 meeting, the subcommittee has met and further revised the policy based on the request made at the April meeting.

TAC approved the draft policy as presented.

**10. Member Reports.**

Geoff Kline announced the October 27, 2005 Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) meeting will discuss the funding of a Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program. He also stated that project applications will receive bonus points if a DBE program is in place.

Neil Cullen announced that the County of San Mateo has been in communication with the Parks Commission regarding submitting bicycle and pedestrian improvement project applications for funding.

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** December 15, 2005

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee

**From:** Sandy Wong

**Subject:** RECOMMENDATION OF THE 2006-07 EXPENDITURE PROGRAM FOR THE TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA) SAN MATEO COUNTY PROGRAM

(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC endorse the recommendations contained in this report for the funding of 2006-07 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) projects.

## FISCAL IMPACT

The allocation of TFCA funds for 2006-07 is expected to be approximately \$1,000,000, of which \$50,000 (5%) will be allocated to administration. It is recommended that the remaining funds (\$950,000) be distributed based on the policies adopted in past years by C/CAG with modifications detailed in the Discussion section. The following table shows how the funds would be distributed based on these policies. The funding provided in these categories for the past three years is also shown.

CATEGORY		2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Employer Based Shuttle Projects	SamTrans	\$471,544	\$495,000	\$605,000	\$535,000
	Menlo Park	\$ 30,732	\$ 35,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 38,000
Countywide TSM Program (Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance)		\$810,767	\$350,000	\$430,000	\$377,000
Administration		\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Totals		\$1,363,043	\$930,000	\$1,125,000	\$1,000,000

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) is authorized under Health and Safety code Section 44223 and 44225 to levy a fee on motor vehicles. Funds generated by the fee are referred to as the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) and are used to implement projects to reduce air pollution from motor vehicles. Health and Safety Code Section 44241(d) stipulates that forty percent (40%) of funds generated within a county where the fee is in effect shall be allocated by the Air District to one or more public agencies designated to receive the funds, and for San Mateo County, C/CAG has been designated as the overall Program Manager to receive the funds.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

For the past eight years the C/CAG Board has allocated the funding among three programs (SamTrans Shuttle Program, City of Menlo Park Shuttle Program, and Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program). It is recommended that this allocation methodology be continued for 2006-07 as follows:

- It is recommended that the SamTrans Shuttle Program receive an allocation of \$535,000 for its current shuttle program and maintain the existing cost sharing formula with SamTrans contributing approximately 25% of the cost of these shuttles and the remaining 25% through employer contributions. This funding recommendation shall be contingent upon SamTrans submitting an acceptable work plan for use of the monies.
- It is recommended that the City of Menlo Park receive an allocation of \$38,000 for its local shuttle program.
- It is recommended that Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance receive an allocation of \$377,000 TFCA funds and continue to receive \$500,000 from the Congestion Relief Plan for a total allocation of \$877,000 for its Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program.
- It is recommended that Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance also continue to receive an allocation of \$70,000 in Regional Rideshare funds that are provided to C/CAG from MTC in order to satisfy the requirements for San Mateo County to be a part of the comprehensive Bay Area wide regional program that assists employers in providing commute alternatives for its workers.

The following are the C/CAG Board policies that will continue to be in effect for the 2006-07 Program.

### **Overall Policies:**

- Cost Effectiveness, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), will be used as initial screening criteria for all projects. Projects must show a cost effectiveness of less than \$90,000 per ton of reduced emissions based upon the TFCA funds allocated in order to be considered.
- The funds allocated for the Alliance is subject to the submission of an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.



#### Shuttle Projects:

- Shuttle projects are defined as the provision of local feeder bus or shuttle service to rail and ferry stations and airports.
- All shuttles must be timed to meet the rail or ferry lines being served.
- C/CAG encourages the use of electric and other clean fuel vehicles for shuttles.
- Beginning with the 2003-04 TFCA funding cycle, all vehicles used in any shuttle/feeder bus service must meet the applicable California Air Resources Board (CARB) particulate matter standards for public transit fleets. This requirement has been made by the BAAQMD and is applicable to the projects funded by the Congestion Management Agencies.

If the recommendations to adopt these policies and revisions to the policies are accepted, the following is a summary of the C/CAG program for 2006-07:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Administration	\$50,000
Regional Rideshare Program	\$0
SamTrans	\$535,000
Menlo Park TSM Program	\$38,000
Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance	\$377,000
Total funds obligated	\$1,000,000
Total funds anticipated	\$1,000,000
Balance	\$0

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- None.



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** December 15, 2005  
**To:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Geoffrey C. Kline, P.E.  
**Subject:** Review and Approval of Proposal for Application and Scoring of Surface Transportation Program (STP) Projects

(For further information or response to questions, contact Geoff Kline at 363-4100)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Technical Advisory Committee Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) approve the proposal for application and scoring of Surface Transportation Program (STP) transportation projects.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

This scoring proposal will develop a procedure to competitively allocate approximately \$5.5 million in Federal Transportation Funding to the jurisdictions and transportation agencies throughout San Mateo County.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Federal funds will be made available from the reauthorization bill titled Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act - Legacy for Users. For purposes of simplicity, it will hereafter be referred to as T-3.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Third Cycle of T-3, covering FYs 2006/2007 through 2008/2009 will have money available for the Local Streets and Roads Program. Eligible roadway projects will comprise rehabilitation, reconstruction, and resurfacing work within the road or street pavement area. All projects must be recognized as being on a road or street on the Federal Classification system- Federal aid eligible.

It is recommended that the following rules to develop an STP priority list be approved:

1. The current and modified scoring system, developed for TEA-21 project application cycles, be used to rank projects.
2. A cap of funds for individual jurisdictions/agencies be set at \$1 million. This guarantees a minimum of six (6) jurisdictions receiving funding.
3. A maximum of ten (10) applications from an individual jurisdiction/agency be accepted. "Local" applications need only be initially submitted.

4. The application deadline will be Friday, February 24, 2006. This is the date that "local" applications are to be received by the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG). No late submittals will be accepted.
5. Amenities - examples: bike lanes, signalization, turn pockets, transit pull-outs, sidewalk ramps, guard rails, sidewalks, curbs, and culverts - are allowed up to 20% of the total project cost. Amenities exceeding 20% of total project cost are considered to be non-pavement and make the project ineligible for STP funding.

The STP Program should be processed in a competitive setting because of time constraints, increased deliverability requirements, and new eligibility requirements. In addition, it is what the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has directed the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to promote. No formula or equity consideration which guarantees funding to all jurisdictions or transportation agencies is being recommended. To insure that all possible projects are considered, a maximum ten (10 project applications, will be accepted.

Applications will be distributed on January 23, 2006, and the deadline for project application submission will be Friday, February 24, 2006. Funding will be distributed based upon project score and specific program funding caps. All jurisdictions and recognized transportation agencies within San Mateo County are eligible to participate in the program.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Application Material.
2. State and Federal Funds Scoring Proposal.

# SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) FEDERAL FUNDS APPLICATION

PROJECT TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT SCOPE/DESCRIPTION \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT LOCATION WITH LIMITS \_\_\_\_\_

SPONSORING JURISDICTION \_\_\_\_\_

CONTACT PERSON \_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

PLANNED OBLIGATION DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

IS PROJECT ON FEDERAL  
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL PROJECT COST (\$000) \_\_\_\_\_

FUNDS REQUESTED (\$000)\* \_\_\_\_\_

\*Maximum Federal funds at 88.5% of total project cost.

A. PROJECT AMENITIES % (Cost of Amenities/Total Project Cost)\*\* \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*Provide cost estimate to verify amenity percentage greater than zero.  
Estimate attached.

READINESS: Field Review/Project Study Report or equivalent Yes / No

DBE Status: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved Draft \_\_\_\_\_ Approved Final

Environmental Review Status \_\_\_\_\_

Right-of-Way Acquisition Status \_\_\_\_\_

PS&E Status \_\_\_\_\_

Agreements/Permits Status \_\_\_\_\_

Y / N Have bicycle/pedestrian facilities been considered for inclusion in the project?

B. Local Funds (\$) \_\_\_\_\_  $\frac{\text{Total Cost - Fed. \$ Requested}}{\text{Total Cost}} = \text{_____ \%}$

C. Multi-Jurisdictional/Agency Participation: 1      2      3      4      5      5+

List Partners: \_\_\_\_\_

D. Road or Street/Transit Classification \_\_\_\_\_

E. Convenience/Safety/Sense of Community: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

F. County Regionality: Complete / Significant / Medium / Minor / None

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

- NOTES:
1. Project applications are due to the City/County Association of Governments no later than: **4:00 P.M., Friday, February 24, 2006. . THIS IS THE FINAL DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR THE STP FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAM.**
  2. Applications will be limited to a maximum of ten (10) submittals per jurisdiction.
  3. A funding cap of \$1 million per jurisdiction/agency will be in effect.
  4. Amenities are defined as signalization, turn pockets, transit pullouts, sidewalk ramps, guardrails, culverts, landscaping, and similar non-pavement portions of the project.

---

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:

Local Match % \_\_\_\_\_

Project qualifies for funding  
consideration \_\_\_\_\_

Amenities % \_\_\_\_\_

## Federal Funds Scoring Proposal

In August 1990, a subcommittee of the City/County Engineers' Association met to incorporate State of Readiness in its scoring criteria. The major problem facing the subcommittee was how to distinguish between a lesser important project in a high state of readiness and an acknowledged important project in a low state of readiness, considering both projects may compete for a limited amount of funds. To that end, the subcommittee developed a proposal which uses a factored value based upon readiness to be multiplied against the total of other scored values. This proposed method tended to eliminate the bias which may surface when evaluating state of readiness versus project importance.

State of Readiness of Federally funded projects will be evaluated as follows at ten (10) points total:

### STATE OF READINESS

(10 pts Max)

Field Review/Project Study Report or equivalent: Yes (1) \_\_\_\_\_ No (0) \_\_\_\_\_ 1

#### Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE):

Approved Draft \_\_\_\_\_ (1) Approved Final \_\_\_\_\_ (2)

#### Environmental Review:

Status \_\_\_\_\_ 1

Expected completion \_\_\_\_\_

1 - CALTRANS final approval/Categorically Excluded (CAT EX) certified

0 - Presubmission stage of review process

#### Right-of-Way Acquisition:

Status \_\_\_\_\_ 2

Expected completion \_\_\_\_\_

2 - Final certification from CALTRANS/ Not Applicable (N/A)

1 - Entered agreement with approved right-of-way agency

0 - No action

#### PS&E:

Status \_\_\_\_\_ 2

Expected completion \_\_\_\_\_

2 - Submitted to CALTRANS: 100% design complete

0 - Presubmission stage of design/concept only

Agreements/Permits:

Status \_\_\_\_\_

2 - Complete/ Not Applicable (N/A)

0 - Incomplete

State of Readiness may vary between 0 and 10 points. Conversion to the weighting factor will be as follows:

State of Readiness Points	Weighting Factor
0	1
1	1.1
2	1.2
3	1.3
4	1.4
5	1.5
↓	↓
10	2

The weighting factor will then be applied to the sum of a number of other values which collectively total 40 points as follows:

	Max. Points
A. Amenities to Project	5
B. Local Funds Match	10
C. Multi-Jurisdictional/Agency	10
D. Road or Street/Transit Classification	10
E. Convenience/ Safety/ Sense of Community	5

The maximum number of points for Items A, B, C, D, and E is 80 (State of Readiness Factor = 2 times 40 points above). The entire scoring criteria will be 100 points as follows:

(Readiness Factor) x (Sum of Specified Items) = 80 pts

F. County-Wide Significance = 10 pts

G. Effectiveness (Cost/Benefit) = 10 pts

100 pts maximum



A. Amenities to Project: Percentage of Total Project Cost (5 pts).

	Points
Ø	5
≤ 5%	4
≤ 10%	3
≤ 15%	2
≤ 20%	1
> 20%	Project Ineligible for Consideration

B. Local Funds (10 pts)\*

	Points
50% or more or >\$2M for Federal projects	10
≥45%	9
≥40%	8
≥35%	7
≥30%	6
≥25%	5
≥20%	4
≥15%	3
≥10%	2
≥5%	1
<5%	0

\*Local funds for Federal projects: Any non-Federal funds used in the project which are supplemental to the requested allocation amount.

C. Multi-Jurisdictional/Agency (10 pts)\*

<u>No. of jurisdictions or agencies</u>	Points
Single jurisdiction or agency	0
2	3
3	5
4	7
5 or more jurisdictions or agencies	10

\*Refers only to those city or county jurisdictions or transportation agencies which are active participants in the project by contributing local funds or administering the project.

D. Road or Street/Transit Classification (10 pts)\*

	Points
Freeway/Interstate or CALTRAIN/BART	10
State highway or complete transit intermodal capability	8
Arterial street or major transit capability	6
Collector street or medium transit capability	4
Local street or minor transit capability	2
Unpaved street or road or lack of transit capability	0

\*As shown on the Federal Classification System.

E.	Convenience Safety/Sense of Community (5 pts)	<b>Points</b>
1.	Directly serves transit	1
2.	Pedestrian safety element	1
3.	Accommodates turn lanes	1
4.	Connects freeway ramp (metering)	1
5.	Community support	1
6.	Improves El Camino Real	1
F.	County Regionality (10 pts)*	<b>Points</b>
	Complete regionality	10
	Significant regionality	7
	Medium regionality	5
	Minor regionality	3
	No regionality	0

\*This relates to how much influence the project has on affecting the travel habits of the residents of San Mateo County. It is a measure of the percentage of the population whose behavior is changed because of the positive effects of the project.

Examples of County regionality - the relative number of people who may be affected by a transportation project, of which the following may apply:

US101 (Bayshore Freeway) or CALTRAIN - complete regionality

El Camino Real (State Route 82) or BART from Colma Station - significant regionality

Holly Street in San Carlos or a city-wide bus route - medium regionality

Hillside Boulevard in Daly City and Colma or a specific bus shelter or bus turnout - minor regionality

Local minor street or absence of transit - no regionality

G. Effectiveness (Cost/Benefit) @ 10 pts

Point Range: -  $\frac{\text{Funds Requested}}{\sum \text{of Items A,B,C,D,E, and F \& Readiness that apply}}$

Point Ranges:			
0	-	5000	= 10 Pts
>5000	-	10000	= + 9 Pts
>10000	-	15000	= + 8 Pts
>15000	-	22000	= + 7 Pts
>22000	-	28000	= + 6 Pts
>28000	-	35000	= + 5 Pts
>35000	-	40000	= + 4 Pts
>40000	-	50000	= + 3 Pts
>50000	-	60000	= + 2 Pts
>60000	-	75000	= + 1 Pts
>75000	-		0 Pts

A hypothetical example follows:

Project information - A collector roadway channelization project has had a field review. The project is designated CAT EX and certified. An agreement for right-of-way certification has only been signed with an appropriate agency, PS&E is still incomplete, and a final approved DBE has been completed. Amenities equal 2% of the cost of the project, which in turn make it safer for pedestrians. Match is minimal. Agreements or permits have been submitted to CALTRANS. The project is requesting \$450,000 in Federal Funds. Scoring Values for Items A, B, C, D, and E total 12 points. County-wide significance is found to be 6 points. Calculations are made accordingly.

State of Readiness:

Field Review	=	1
DBE: final approved	=	2
CAT EX certified	=	1
Right-of-Way agreement made	=	1
PS&E incomplete	=	0
Agreements/permits submitted	=	0
Total Points	=	5

Weighting Factor	=	1.5
X Sum of (A, B, C,D, & E)	=	12
[4+3+0+4+1]	18	= 18 pts

+ F. County-Wide Significance = 6

+ Effectiveness =  $\frac{\$ \text{ Requested}}{\text{Sum of (A+B+C+D+E+F+ Readiness)}}$

$$= \frac{450,000}{(12 \text{ as given}) + (\text{Significance} = 6) + (\text{Readiness} = 5)} = \frac{450,000}{12+6+5}$$

$$= 19,565.2 \text{ (represents 7 pts. from cost effectiveness chart)}$$

Total Score\* = 31 points of a possible 100 points

\*(Weighted Score + F + Effectiveness) = (18 + 6 + 7)

# **Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring**

State of Readiness		A. Amenities to Project		B. Local Funds	
Field Review/Project Study Report or equivalent:		Percentage of Total Project Cost:		50% or more or >2 million	
	1	0			10
		0	5	≥45%	9
DBE:	2	1	0	≥40%	8
		≤5%	4	≥35%	7
Environmental Review:	1	0		≥30%	6
		≤10%	3	≥25%	5
Right-of- Way Acquisition:	2	1	0	≥20%	4
		≤15%	2	≥15%	3
PS&E:	2	0		≥10%	2
		≤20%	1	≥5%	1
Agreements/Permits:	2	0		<5%	0
		>20%	Project Ineligible for Consideration		
Total Readiness Points:					

# Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring

C. Multi-Jurisdictional/Agency	D. Road or Street/Transit Classification	E. Convenience/ Safety/ Sense of Community*
5 or more jurisdictions or agencies - 10	Freeway/Interstate or CALTRAIN/BART	Directly serves transit - 1
4 - 7	State highway/complete transit intermodal capability - 8	Pedestrian safety element - 1
3 - 5	Arterial street/major transit capability - 6	Accommodates turn lanes - 1
2 - 3	Collector street/medium transit capability - 4	Connects freeway ramp (metering) - 1
1 - 0	Local street/minor transit capability - 2	Community support - 1
	Unpaved street or road/ lack of transit capability - 0	Improves El Camino Real - 1

\*5 points maximum.

**Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring**

<b>F. County Regionality</b>		<b>G. Effectiveness (Cost/Benefit)</b>			
Complete regionality	- 10	>5000	-	>5000	10
		>5000	-	10000	9
		>10000	-	15000	8
Significant regionality	- 7	>15000	-	22000	7
		>22000	-	28000	6
Medium regionality	- 5	>28000	-	35000	5
		>35000	-	40000	4
Minor regionality	- 3	>40000	-	50000	3
		>50000	-	60000	2
		>60000	-	75000	1
No regionality	- 0	>75000	-		0

# Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring

## Point Scoring

<u>State or Readiness Points</u>	<u>Readiness Weighting Factor</u>
0	1
1	1.1
2	1.2
↓	↓
10	2

-20-

$$\text{Effectiveness Point Range} = \frac{\text{Funds Requested}}{\Sigma \text{ of Items A through F} + \text{Readiness Points}}$$

G. Effectiveness points related to corresponding point range.

STP Program: )

(Readiness Weighting Factor) ( $\Sigma$  of A, B, C, D, and E)

F.	County Regionality	=	10
----	--------------------	---	----

$$\text{G. Effectiveness (Cost/Benefit)} = \frac{10}{10}$$

100

Jurisdiction/Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Project: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring**

1. Points score will be the sole mechanism to determine project ranking and priority. Item G - Effectiveness - will be used to break tie project scores.
2. Project submittals will be limited to a maximum of ten (1) submittals per jurisdiction or agency.
3. There will be a maximum allocation of \$1 Million per jurisdiction or agency for roadway projects.
4. Amenities to the project are allowed to a maximum of 20% of the total project cost. Amenities exceeding 20% of total project cost will cause the project to become ineligible for further funding consideration. It is very critical that this provision of the STP Program be followed.
5. Project submittals which divide a large project into smaller segments of the same project in order to develop high score points and gain an unfair advantage over other projects will be accepted only as one (1) large project unless there is a very valid reason for dividing the project initially.
6. Failure to provide requested information will result in a corresponding loss of potential scoring points from any designated scoring category.
7. Failure to submit STP Program project applications before the established submission deadline is reached will eliminate that project from further consideration for funding in the current project funds program cycle.



## **STP Project Example**

The City of Skunk Hollow, with 23,000 residents, will be repaving its main street, "A" Way, between Red and White Streets. Work will consist of resurfacing "A" Way and modifying a section of sidewalk to accommodate new overhead lighting. No construction has occurred to date; however, a final Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) has been approved.

Skunk Hollow will contribute \$40,000 to the total estimated project cost of \$250,000. The sidewalk work will cost an estimated \$45,000. "A" Way is considered to be something between a collector and arterial street. It is served by 2 bus routes with a daily total of 25 transit trips. Skunk Hollow will perform all work within its jurisdictional limits; however, Barney's Bus Line, with purple logo, is very interested in the project and will provide an initial payment of \$15,000 toward the resurfacing work. Volume (v) to capacity (c) ratio will not change because of the project. The 17 recorded roadway accidents are expected to be reduced by a marginal amount. The project is expected to be obligated in July 2007, according to Engineer Rolly Hills. The "Scrub Bucket", a local gourmet restaurant, has voiced its objections to the project because the new lighting will provide too much illumination for diners. A letter has recently been received from a Mr. Lincoln Logg which indicates support for the project, especially the new lighting component.

# SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) FEDERAL FUNDS APPLICATION

PROJECT TITLE 'A' Way Repaving

PROJECT SCOPE/DESCRIPTION Resurface street and remove/realign sidewalk near the intersection of Loony Lane in preparation for new overhead lighting.

PROJECT LOCATION WITH LIMITS "A" Way: Red Street - White Street

SPONSORING JURISDICTION Shunk Hollow

CONTACT PERSON Nolly Huns TELEPHONE NUMBER Unlisted

PLANNED OBLIGATION DATE: July 2007 IS PROJECT ON FEDERAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM? YES ☒ NO ☐

TOTAL PROJECT COST (\$000) 250

FUNDS REQUESTED (\$000)\* 195

\*Maximum Federal funds at 88.5% of total project cost.

$$18 = \frac{45,000}{250,000}$$

A. PROJECT AMENITIES % (Cost of Amenities/Total Project Cost)\*\* 18

\*\*Provide cost estimate to verify amenity percentage greater than zero.

Estimate attached.

READINESS: Field Review/Project Study Report or equivalent Yes ☐ No ☒  
 DBE Status: \_\_\_\_\_ Approved Draft ☒ Approved Final ☐  
 Environmental Review Status ☒  
 Right-of-Way Acquisition Status ☒  
 PS&E Status ☒  
 Agreements/Permits Status ☒

☒ Y ☐ N

Have bicycle/pedestrian facilities been considered for inclusion in the project?

B. Local Funds (\$) 55,000  $\frac{\text{Total Cost - Fed. \$ Requested}}{\text{Total Cost}} = \underline{22\%}$

C. Multi-Jurisdictional/Agency Participation: 1 (2) 3 4 5 5+

List Partners: Sumner Hollow Barney's Bus Line

D. Road or Street/Transit Classification Collector Street

E. Convenience/Safety/Sense of Community:

1. Serves transit → bus  
2. Ped safety → sidewalk + lights  
3. Community support → letter from Mt. LCGG

F. County Regionality: Complete / Significant / Medium / Minor / None

Remarks: Possible legal problem with lighting.

- NOTES:
1. Project applications are due to the City/County Association of Governments no later than: 4:00 P.M., Friday, February 24, 2006. . **THIS IS THE FINAL DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR THE STP FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAM.**
  2. Applications will be limited to a maximum of ten (10) submittals per jurisdiction.
  3. A funding cap of \$1 million per jurisdiction/agency will be in effect.
  4. Amenities are defined as signalization, turn pockets, transit pullouts, sidewalk ramps, guardrails, culverts, landscaping, and similar non-pavement portions of the project.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:

Local Match % 22

Project qualifies for funding consideration ✓

Amenities % 18

# Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring

State of Readiness	A. Amenities to Project	B. Local Funds
Field Review/Project Study Report or equivalent: 1 0	Percentage of Total Project Cost: 0	50% or more or >2 million -
DBE: <u>2</u> 1 0	5 4	≥45% ≥40% -
Environmental Review: 1 0	≤5% 3	≥35% ≥30% -
Right-of-Way Acquisition: 2 1 0	≤10% 2	5 ≥25% -
PS&E: 2 0	≤15% 18% <u>1</u>	≥20% ≥15% -
Agreements/Permits: 2 0	>20% Project Ineligible for Consideration	2 1 0
Total Readiness Points: <u>2</u>		
Readiness Weighting Factor: <u>1.2</u>		

# Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring

C. Multi-Jurisdictional/Agency	D. Road or Street/Transit Classification	E. Convenience/ Safety/ Sense of Community*
5 or more jurisdictions or agencies - 10	Freeway/Interstate or CALTRAIN/BART - 10	Directly serves transit - 1
4 - 7	State highway/complete transit intermodal capability - 8	Pedestrian safety element - 1
3 - 5	Arterial street/major transit capability - 6	Accommodates turn lanes - 1
2 - 3	Collector street/medium transit capability - 4	Connects freeway ramp (metering) - 1
1 - 0	Local street/minor transit capability - 2	Community support - 1
	Unpaved street or road/ lack of transit capability - 0	Improves El Camino Real - 1

\*5 points maximum.

# Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring

F. County Regionality		G. Effectiveness (Cost/Benefit)			
	-	10	>5000	-	10
Complete regionality		>5000	-	10000	-
		>10000	-	15000	-
	-	>15000	-	22000	-
Significant regionality		>22000	-	28000	-
	-	>28000	-	35000	-
		>35000	-	40000	-
Medium regionality		>40000	-	50000	-
	-	>50000	-	60000	-
		>60000	-	75000	-
No regionality	-	>75000	-	-	0

195,000

A B C D E F  
1+1+3+4+3+3+

(Roadiness = 2)

195,000

20

= 9750

# Surface Transportation Program (STP) Federal Funds Project Scoring

## Point Scoring

<u>State or Readiness Points</u>	<u>Readiness Weighting Factor</u>
0	1
1	1.1
2	1.2
↓	↓
10	2

Effectiveness Point Range = Funds Requested  
Σ of Items A through F + Readiness Points

G. Effectiveness points related to corresponding point range.

STP Program: )	1 4 3 4 3	<u>Maximum Points</u>
(Readiness Weighting Factor) (Σ of A, B, C, D, and E)	=	80
F. County Regionality	=	10
G. Effectiveness (Cost/Benefit)	=	<u>10</u>
	=	100

$$15(1.2) = 18$$

$$- 3$$

$$- 9$$


---


$$30$$

Jurisdiction/Agency: Sumner Hollow Score: 30

Project: 'A' Way Repaving